**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**

**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITON NO.8846 OF 2005**

Shri Sahebrao R. Patil ..Petitioner.

V/s.

The Union Carbide India Ltd. & Ors. ..Respondents.

**WITH**

**WRIT PETITON NO.8847 OF 2005**

Shri Kaliprasad Jaiswal ..Petitioner.

V/s.

The Union Carbide India Ltd. & Ors. ..Respondents.

**WITH**

**WRIT PETITON NO.8848 OF 2005**

Shri P. S. Dalvi ..Petitioner.

V/s.

The Union Carbide India Ltd. & Ors. ..Respondents.

**WITH**

**WRIT PETITON NO.8866 OF 2005**

Shri Gulab Balu Ghodke ..Petitioner.

V/s.

The Union Carbide India Ltd. & Ors. ..Respondents.

**WITH**

**WRIT PETITON NO.8867 OF 2005**

Shri Vishwanath N.Ghag ..Petitioner.

V/s.

The Union Carbide India Ltd. & Ors. ..Respondents.

**WITH**

**WRIT PETITON NO.8970 OF 2005**

Shri Makhuram Jaiswal ..Petitioner.

V/s.

The Union Carbide India Ltd. & Ors. ..Respondents.

None for petitioner.

**CORAM : V.C.DAGA, J.**

**DATED : 25TH APRIL, 2006.**

**P.C. :-**

. None for the petitioner. Perused the petition. Having gone through the petition, it is clear that finding of fact is recorded by the Courts below. There is absolutely no evidence on record to show that the workman-petitioner has completed 240 days of continuous work in a year. In that view of the matter, it was not necessary for the employer to comply the provisions of sections 25(F) & 25 (G) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In view the said findings, the reference came to be answered in the negative. No case is made out to entertain these petitions. Petitions stand dismissed in limine with no order as to costs.

*******